



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

here, and ask Dr. Hunt to inform us what he considers to be the proper functions of the brain; because I consider the burden of proof lies with him, as he has attacked no tenet of phrenology except the one I have acknowledged him to be justified in exposing, but which, according to what phrenologists otherwise state that "the brain is not a single organ, but a congeries of organs," may be treated more as a grammatical than a scientific error.

It would have served Dr. Hunt's purpose better, and would have done greater justice to phrenology, if he had stated his objections in a more tangible form, as, with the exception I have noticed, he has attacked none of the doctrines of phrenology, and, until he has done this, phrenologists can offer no defence.

Let me, however, assure Dr. Hunt that the "modern phrenologists" who are known to me have as sincere a desire to investigate into all the laws of the nature of man as any anthropologist can have; but I do not consider it an unwise course to pursue the study of one department of his complex nature, in preference to spreading that study over so vast a field as the whole of it embraces.

THE DUNDEE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE.

WE have to record an event, which, it is more than probable, will have an important bearing on the progress of the science of man.

Our readers will have been informed in previous numbers that some difficulties were anticipated by the anthropologists who were going to Scotland. Some residents at Dundee shared this opinion, and formed themselves into a committee for the reception of anthropologists. The official report of the proceedings of this committee having been given to the public in the report of Mr. C. W. Devis to the Anthropological Society, it is not necessary for us to dwell on these particulars. Suffice it to say, that all arrangements were made for the Association, but the programme came out, and there was no department for anthropology.

Under these circumstances a meeting of the Anthropologists and their friends in Dundee was held, and it was decided to hold a Conference forty-eight hours later.

It is not our object or duty to dilate on what was then done. We have only to record what took place at the Conference, and the result

of the same on the future prospects of Anthropologists in the British Association for the advantage of science. The following account of the speeches at the Conference is taken from the *Dundee Advertiser*, a newspaper which gave better reports of the meetings of the Association than any other paper has ever been known to do. By printing this from the public papers of the time, we shall be giving this address an historical nature. We may also add that this address was reprinted in the London *Daily News*, and also in most of the Scotch newspapers.

Between four and five hundred of members, or associates of the British Association or members of the Conference attended the meeting, which was of the most enthusiastic character throughout.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

Dr. JAMES HUNT, on taking the chair, said—A few days ago I left the south of England, on a journey, and with a duty which caused me no little anxiety and a slight feeling of dread. For the last twelve-months I have been receiving letters from north of the Tweed telling me that the people of Scotland had made up their minds to declare war against the students of a branch of science in which I have long taken a deep interest. But not only have I received letters, but my attention has been directed to published articles, letters, and pamphlets, the perusal of which productions have produced mingled feelings of amazement and indignation. There may be other members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science who have also seen the publications to which I have alluded. By one person I was told that it was no use for Anthropologists to go to Dundee, for the people would not hear them. Another hinted that there were means to be employed which would remove any fears existing in Scotland against us. Of the amount of truth in this charge I know not, nor do I think it worth while to waste time in dwelling on this point. I think I shall be expressing a general feeling amongst the Anthropologists when I say that, however deeply and sincerely we regret the present position of our science in the Scientific Congress of Great Britain, we, at the same time, feel most sincerely that the non-formation of the Anthropological Department in the British Association was purely and solely based on an honest conviction of what they thought would most tend to the real advancement of science. I feel it my duty to make this statement at the outset, because I know that with many persons there exists a very strong feeling that we have been badly and unfairly treated. I know also that some have felt great regret, if not annoyance, by the exclusion of the Anthropological Department in the Association. Many declared to me that they would never have come to Dundee had they known what was to happen, while some of the local Association have also intimated similar opinions. I am sorry to perceive that there prevails a very general misconception respecting our exact relations with the British Association. To those persons who feel any annoyance with the Association, let me

entreat of them at once to relinquish such feelings. What has been decided on this occasion has been done with my own most entire sanction. I am both willing and anxious to have the entire responsibility of what has been decided. On Wednesday last it was in my power to have proposed a department for Anthropology in connection with the Biological Section. I fully and most carefully considered the matter, and did not feel it my duty under the circumstances to do so. At that time I felt that the papers I had brought up, and which I thought would have been passed by the Biological Committee, would not be sufficient to have supplied a department with sufficient papers. I felt, too, most strongly the real absurdity of having Ethnology in one place and Anthropology in another. I felt, too, a desire to go and hear my old friends and colleagues read their papers, and still more disinclined to do anything which could offend any members or associates of the Association. I felt justified in the course I then adopted, and deeply regret that some of my local friends, in their zeal for our cause, should have expressed themselves in language likely to give offence to the authorities of the Association. On the part of those gentlemen, I beg to say that the first feeling of annoyance and indignation has passed entirely away on the real facts being explained. By our present arrangements, we hope to be able to hear our friends and colleagues, the Ethnologists. I have only to regret that two of the papers read to Section E yesterday, by Mrs. Linton and Mr. John Crawford, I had the pleasure and satisfaction of hearing read at the Ethnological Society of London during its past session. Had the Biological Section allowed us thus to proceed, we could have kept up a department until the next meeting of the Association. Yesterday morning a meeting of strangers and residents in this town was held to consider what was best to be done for our science under the circumstances to which I have alluded. The situation was one of no small difficulty and delicacy. On the one hand, we had apparently—but only apparently—against us the most eminent scientific men of the age, to offend whom would be an act of both madness and ingratitude. On the other, we were told that the hostility of the people of Dundee against Anthropology was too great to allow students to speak out what they believe to be true. But great as we saw our difficulties and dangers, only one thing was wanted to bring us thus together. No sooner was it faintly hinted that we should desert our sinking ship than with one accord we felt the utter impossibility of such a step. Whatever offence we may have the misfortune to give either to the authorities of the Association or the people of Dundee, yet we all feel it better to receive the most virulent abuse rather than incur the contempt the desertion of our post would entail on us. Our first difficulty was to find one whom we could ask to take command of our apparently sinking cause. I suggested an appeal to some of the eminent men of science at present in Dundee, or to one of the distinguished and well-known residents of this town; but my friends all declared that it was my duty to them and to the cause of Anthropological Science generally, to rescue them from their embarrassing if not perilous position. I crave, therefore, the sympathy of the people of Scotland when I tell them that I now

occupy the position of President of the meeting merely to avert the contempt I should have received had I declined to obey the wishes of my colleagues and friends. To very many our cause appears, I believe, utterly hopeless, and they think that we should have shown more wisdom and more discretion had we gone back to our homes, and had we allowed the present opinions respecting the aim and method of Anthropological Science to be left to time to be corrected. If we had consulted our own ease and comfort, I have no doubt we should have followed this course. But there is one character which perhaps belongs peculiarly to Anthropologists—viz., the feeling of duty, combined with a nearly irresistible inclination to defend themselves when they believe they are unjustly attacked. But while it is the character of the Anthropologist to defend himself every now and then, he is at the same time a lover of peace, and would never enter into contentions unless really obliged. With regard to the British Association, let it be most distinctly understood that we have no charge or grievance to bring against that body. There are some men who, utterly ignorant of our real feeling and position, will not hesitate to declare that we are in search of a grievance, and that we desire to make ourselves martyrs, and the authorities of the Association our persecutors. Nothing, I feel sure, is further from our desire or from our intentions, than to complain of our present position. We have too much respect for our science, and too high an estimate of Dundee to appear in any such character. We all feel it, however unfortunate, that up to this time it has not been found convenient, or perhaps thought desirable, to have a separate Section or Department in which all the Students of the Science of Man could meet together and discuss subjects in which they are mutually interested. I have heard it hinted that we demand that such a Section or Department shall have the name Anthropology. This supposition is wholly erroneous. We merely express a hope that, in a great national body like the British Association, it may be found convenient at some early day to have a special Section devoted to the Science of Man and Mankind. In the meantime it has been thought desirable that an attempt should be made to bring a few students of the Science of Man together, by holding two or three meetings to discuss questions in which we all feel mutually interested. If I had thought such a course would be likely to produce dissensions amongst students of the same science, I for one would have taken no part in it. So fully am I convinced that the real progress of science is best advanced by a friendly, although entirely free, interchange of sentiments, that I should ever deeply regret that our present meeting should have this effect. Feeling, however, no fear on this point, I will proceed to touch on the aim and method of the Science of Mankind, now known in the greater part of Europe under the name of Anthropology. My brother Anthropologists will pardon me if I take this opportunity of merely explaining the aim and method of the Science. Before the conclusion of the sittings I trust to be enabled to lay before them a few remarks on a subject in which all modern Anthropologists are so intensely interested, viz., the Principles of Anthropological Classification. Nor do I think our time will

be entirely wasted if we once again consider, in an apparently hostile atmosphere, what are the objects we propose to ourselves by studying the past history and present physical and other characters of those beings called Men. Whether or no, however, Anthropologists may be agreed on the aim and method of their Science, it is equally certain that the great majority of the public generally, and perhaps of the British Association, do not yet fully understand either our aim or our methods. The past confusion of our Science in the meetings of the Association is purely the result of the want of some general agreement on this point. It is the knowledge that this is the real cause of our past and present difficulties which inspires me with the hope and expectation of bringing about a change which will be agreeable to all parties, and which, I contend, would do much to advance general science. Now, the aim of the Anthropologists is to build up a science under the title of Anthropology or some other denomination. The astronomer studies the motions and laws regulating the starry firmament; the geologist studies the laws regulating the formation of the crust of the earth; the botanist the laws regulating the formation and development of plants; the zoologist the laws regulating the formation and distribution of animals; and the Anthropologist studies the laws regulating the formation and distribution of mankind; and they each profess to do it by the same method. The Geologist unfolds the laws of the past by a study of the laws of the present; and the Botanist, Zoologist, and Anthropologist do the same. The science of Geology has for its object the discovery of the laws regulating the past history of the earth; the Botanist the past history of plants; the Zoologist the past history of animals; and the Anthropologist the past history of man. Anthropology, then, has for its aim both the present state and past history of mankind. In days not long passed, it was thought that the Geologist had no right to attempt to discover the past history of the earth, and even down to this very time there are, I believe, persons who think that it is not right scientifically to attempt to discover the past history of plants, animals, or mankind. Botanists and Zoologists, however, seem to be allowed to go on very quietly with their investigations; and why not allow Anthropologists to do the same? Their aim and their method are, or ought to be, identical. Two objections are, however, raised to these views from two opposite and mutually destructive grounds. One very large party say—as they formerly said of the study of the laws regulating the formation of the earth's crust—that the natural history of Man should not be studied, and for exactly the same reasons. But, if we consult the works of any modern writers who enjoy a deservedly high reputation amongst the public, like Professor Owen, we find it there clearly and distinctly asserted that Mankind is a proper object for study, description, and classification. The late Dr. Prichard, up to the year of his death, was urging a recognition of the science of Man by the Association. After a contention of many years, he succeeded in attaining a sub-section, or department, of the zoological department. The name introduced into the Association still remains, but let me ask any impartial member of the Association or of this Conference,

whether the natural history of man at present receives that attention and consideration which its importance and interest demand? The difference between the authorities of the Association and Anthropologists does not consist of diversity of opinion respecting the scientific study of man; the only difference is respecting the importance and position which shall be assigned to the Science. Anthropologists profess to make mankind a subject of scientific study—the British Association do the same. If, therefore, the natural history of mankind is not a suitable object of scientific study we are not to blame. The other party contend that Man is merely an animal, and that it is not necessary that he should be studied separately. The Anthropologist disagrees with both propositions, and occupies a moderate and entirely scientific position. If Anthropology is not less important than Geology, Zoology, or Botany, why should it have an inferior position? We consider that we are doing a real service to Science by endeavouring to remove the anomaly now existing in the Association respecting our Science. We hoped that what took place at Birmingham would have settled the matter: but no permanent settlement will, or can, take place until Ethnology and Anthropology be united in one department. On behalf of Anthropologists, we are much indebted for the defence made by the Rev. George Gilfillan. But, unfortunately, he defended them as though they had some theory to support. If they had a theory to support, they would have deserved all the hard things said of them, and would have had no claim to a place in the British Association or any other scientific body. There were as many theories respecting Anthropology as there were Anthropologists. Cardinal Wiseman was once asked if he thought it desirable that persons of the Roman Catholic faith should attend the Anthropological Society. He replied, "Yes, listen and say nothing, and when you are all agreed come and tell me." Anthropologists were not likely yet to be agreed on anything connected with their science. Theologians would do well to follow Dr. Wiseman's teaching. Science was by its nature progressive. The attempt to reconcile it at every stage of its existence was most absurd. It was said that the Scotch could not bear suspense. But suspense was the normal condition of all truly scientific men. The fact that there were eminent Scotch scientific men sufficiently refuted such a charge. Some had charged Anthropologists with having advocated the ape origin of man. But he hardly knew a single Anthropologist in England, or indeed on the Continent, who has not declared that the position of Man's place in Nature, as propounded by Professor Huxley, had been discussed too early. They had met together to discuss scientific questions, entirely irrespective of what might be the local feelings regarding them. There did not exist different opinions for London and Dundee. Two principles were found necessary by Anthropologists in London—to be obeyed in all papers and discussions. First, no theological or religious questions were allowed to be attacked or defended; and secondly, discussion was allowed as to the tendency of their Science. He should not attempt to disguise the real character of Anthropology. The introduction of Anthropology as a purely inductive Science was no doubt to some extent a revolution

in general Science. It had made its appearance in Europe when Metaphysics and Philosophy had become blended with Physiology—producing the bastard science known under the name of Phrenology. Their duty was to found a science of man on comparative Anatomy, comparative Physiology, and comparative Psychology, entirely free from all Metaphysical assumption. Besides this, to found the Science, it was necessary most minutely to study Man's past works. All branches of Science had to be compared before they could found a really lasting theory. They had no pet theories to support on any of these questions; no sensational papers to introduce. They were met together for work and for mutual instruction. Of all their facts and all their deductions, they invited the most rigid investigation and criticism. They craved for liberty to be allowed to discuss scientific questions simply and solely as such. Before the end of this meeting it would (he thought) be seen how grossly, yet no doubt unintentionally, their objects had been misrepresented. They had three objects in holding this Conference. First, that they might have a chance of meeting together; secondly, to remove the vast misconception existing in the public mind regarding this Science, and thirdly, to show that although disappointed they were not disheartened—and I think that what looks like misfortune may, by judicious conduct on our part, turn eventually to the benefit of our Science. Whatever might be the future of the Science of Man in the British Association, it should not be a failure for want of zeal on our part. We endeavour to give it that importance to which it is fully entitled. In conclusion (he said) I would invite those who will persist in attacking us, and endeavouring to raise a feeling of disgust against us, because of our adherence to Darwinism—to earnestly look at the real facts. If they will do so, they will find that if there be one society or one body of men who have more earnestly, more continually, persisted in attacking and endeavouring to refute the doctrines respecting man's origin by Mr. Darwin, or either of his disciples, that body is composed of men calling themselves Anthropologists. Nearly every objection of a scientific character which is to be found against the Darwinian theory of man's origin is to be found in the publications of the Anthropological Society. These statements I put forward as facts, and not as our justification, much less of anything of which we ought to boast. It so happens, however, that for nearly five years the publications of the London Society of Anthropology have teemed with objections to the Darwinian theory of the origin of man. From the first to the nineteenth number of the *Anthropological Review* just published, you will hardly examine a number without finding some objection to this theory. So great and so continued have been the objections we have continually raised against Darwinism, as now being taught in this country, that it has been our misfortune to have failed to gain the adherence of the great mass of Mr. Darwin's more immediate disciples. Professor Huxley for five years has been our most deadly, and sometimes even our most bitter, foe. He has on more than one occasion declared his hostility to us; while, on our part, our attacks on the views of Professor Huxley have been of the same deadly and

perhaps bitter character. Last year Professor Huxley came to Nottingham, but, I am well assured, out of no love to us, and much less with any fear; but, I believe, as a mere act of justice, he used his influence to improve the position of the Science of Man in the British Association. Our conduct looks like ingratitude, for we have never ceased to attack his views. A fact or an expression of opinion has only to appear against the Darwinian origin of man when it at once seems to find its way into the pages of the publications of the Anthropological Society. If the Society, as a body, have shown unanimity of sentiment on any one point, it has been, I believe, against the Darwinian theory of man's origin, as propounded by Professor Huxley, being warranted by the facts already known. For my own part, I have felt for some time that enough has now been said by us against the views of Mr. Darwin and his English disciples. Let it, however, be well understood that in attacking the views of Mr. Darwin and Professor Huxley we do not in any way relinquish that feeling of admiration and respect for their labours which every man who has the honour of his country at heart cannot fail to feel. Mr. Darwin is a man especially on whose labours no real student of Science can look without the most intense satisfaction and gratitude. His work on the *Origin of Species* is one of the most glorious and most praiseworthy publications of the nineteenth century; while Professor Huxley is a man who is one of the hopes, and, I trust, glories of British Science. He is a man who has shown that he will render justice to his direst foes. His conduct last year in our behalf gained for him the admiration and applause of not only every Anthropologist in this country, but of most of the leading scientific men of Europe. The simple act of justice on his part was thought by many to be an act of generosity. On the opinions of Professor Huxley we look as we ever did; but our admiration for the character of the man has, with one accord, all been greatly intensified from this generous and manly act. The present state of feeling with regard to Anthropology among scientific men, and also amongst the general public, arises, I believe, from an entirely mistaken notion respecting its aim and method. When it is once fully realised that it is purely a science of induction—when it becomes known that we have no theory to support, and only use hypothesis to be better able to classify our facts, and are ever ready to change our theories when the discovery of new facts warrants our doing so—then will the time come when we may hope that Anthropology shall receive that support from all classes of society which its importance demands. Let those once fearless champions of geological science and of other sciences but once fully realise our object and our method, they will at once come forward to extend the right hand of fellowship to us. Our great men of science, who direct the affairs of the Association, have not yet, I think, sufficiently examined into this matter. I trust that they may now be induced to do so. We in this country know too well the position which the science of Anthropology takes in France, Germany, and, indeed, wherever science exists, to allow ourselves to be daunted by difficulties or abuse. The students of the Science of Mankind in Great Britain feel, with their colleagues in other lands, that a general scientific body without the

Science of Anthropology, is like an arch without the keystone. We shall be content to wait in patience until this is seen and felt by others. In the meantime we intend to go on with our work. We neither court the applause nor fear the censure of any one. I hope and believe that not one sentence will be said here which can justly offend any one who favours us with his company. It is not our habit or custom to willingly do violence to the feelings of others. We commence our labours to-day, and I trust to the good feeling of the people of Dundee, and the good sense of those who take part in our proceedings, to make our meeting at Dundee memorable for the recognition it gives to the Science of Anthropology. I trust the people of Dundee will cease their attacks on our Science. Attack our facts or opinions as much as you feel inclined, but, for your own sakes, and for the credit of your country, do not longer attack the Science. We seek to discover from actual facts these laws regulating man's nature and development, not because such discoveries will lead to our material interests, but because we believe the discovery of these laws will form the basis of correct principles of human happiness; and, as these laws become fully established by scientific inquiry, misery and ignorance will have to give place to civilisation and enlightenment.

JOHN PLANT, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L., proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Hunt for his address. He said he had to ask the meeting to agree that the explanation by Dr. Hunt of the position and objects of the Anthropologists was satisfactory and worthy of acceptance by those present. Some might imagine that the Anthropologists desired to place themselves in opposition to the British Association, or to make themselves independent thereof; but such was not the case. They simply desired to assert the claims of Anthropology as an independent science. They merely wished that it might next year and thereafter be allowed its proper prominence in the programme of the British Association. He, for his own part, had heard a good deal before arriving at Dundee of the prejudice existing in the town against Anthropology, but he scouted the idea that any such narrow-minded views belonged to the inhabitants of so important a city. He thought rather that such prejudices had been imported by those accompanying the British Association from the south, than that they pertained to the banks of the Tay. He did not want to know the motives that have made the British Association jealous of anthropological science, but at all events he did not wish the papers he had prepared in connection therewith read in departments such as anatomy or zoology. He was sorry that there was a virulent discussion in the Dundee papers in connection with anthropology last year. He did not believe that newspaper discussion of scientific subjects led to much use. He had taken part in them himself, and felt all their bitterness and futility. The theories, foisted and fathered upon the anthropologists by enemies and quasi-friends, had disparaged their science in the estimation of some, but truth reverently followed up, and nature humbly and patiently investigated, would always have partisans. He did not fear for the future of anthropology if they only pursued their science by the method pointed out by Dr. Hunt.

Dr. GRIERSON said he had much pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks to Dr. Hunt. Last year at the British Association meeting at Nottingham he had on some points opposed Dr. Hunt. That gentleman had read from authorities in support of his views, and he had thought justified in quoting Biblical testimony in reply. Dr. Hunt had said he and his friends had never intended to make and never would make any attack on theology. All he would say, therefore, in conclusion, was that if there were no new attack there would be no defence. He trusted and fondly believed that anthropology and Christianity would be found to go hand in hand. At all events, if one word were said in Scotland against theology there were ten thousand Scottish tongues ready to defend it.

Dr. PAGE next addressed the meeting—If it were asked, he said, why a lame and disabled man like himself should be present on this occasion, he would answer at once, that he came there to raise his voice, feeble as that might be, in the cause of science, and to protest, at the same time, against the inconsistency of the Council of the British Association. He would not, indeed, have been present in Dundee had he not learned a few days before of the attempt to extinguish, in his opinion, one of the most important sections of the Association. He would not enter into the history of the long struggle which the anthropologists had had to establish their position in the Association, and which had already been adverted to by Dr. Hunt; but every one must be convinced of the glaring inconsistency of the British Association in having opened the door to them in 1866, and, without any reason assigned, closed it against them in 1867. What circumstances had occurred, he would ask, since 1866, either in the history of anthropology or in the conduct of its supporters, to have led to this result? This was a question to be answered by the Council, and in an Association professing to be for the advancement of science, the public would look for a distinct and unmistakable reply with no little interest. It was true they had been told the problems of anthropology could be discussed at the Biological, or the Geographical, and Ethnological Sections, and so far as man was a mere animal that might well be. But man was something more; he had, over and above his fellow-creatures, an intellectual, moral, and religious nature. He was a fabricator, not merely of mechanical tools, by which he became a modifier of nature, and, to some extent, a sub-creator; but he was also the inventor of intellectual tools—of political, social, moral, and religious schemes, by which he secured the elevation and advancement of his race—thus separating him immensely from the lower animals, and placing him in a category that could not be properly considered either in a Zoological or Ethnological Section. And what, after all, was it that anthropology sought after? Why, the natural history of man; and if they were free to investigate the nature of plants and animals without let or hindrance, much more were they entitled to do so in the case of man. Every man in the town had his individuality corporeally and mentally. They could not all become poets or painters, mathematicians or astronomers—and just as surely as men had their individuality, so had nations, and it was individual

character which was the highest aim and object of anthropology. So long as nations had this individuality, the same causes that were operative on one race would be totally ineffectual in another; and not till these peculiarities had been established could commerce, or missions, or education, have their first or legitimate effects. People talked of civilisation, of admixture and amalgamation of races, but there could never be amalgamations where nature had established wide racial distinctions, and all such attempts either ended in failure, or, what was worse, often in the debasement and degeneration of the higher race, which vainly sought such amalgamation. He need not point to South and North America as striking examples of this truth in opposite directions. Such, among many others, had he time to enumerate, were the uses of anthropology; and what, he would ask, therefore, was the cause of the odium which the science had on this occasion incurred? There was no use of blinking the matter. The Council were evidently pandering to popular prejudices, and striving with uneasy tenderness to get rid of a difficult subject. He had no wish to offend prejudices where he had little chance of establishing convictions; but if these prejudices stood in the way of truth then offended they must be. The anthropologist had his convictions and opinions like other men; but with this difference, that their opinions resolved themselves into creeds, while his only remained with him as beliefs. A creed subscribed to and bound to be defended as a thing final and irresistible, was one thing; a belief entertained according to present knowledge, but liable to be changed as newer knowledge was acquired, was a thing altogether different. It was this war of a creed and the search after further truth that lay at the bottom of the whole matter. It was the setting up of Oriental cosmogonies of four or five thousand years ago, against the newer knowledge which science was every day earnestly, anxiously, truthfully, and prayerfully endeavouring to reveal. It was the old question of reconciliation—the attempt to harmonise what could never be harmonised without committing treason against science and dishonour to religion. If there were to be reconciliation let their opponents attempt it; as for them, it was enough to labour after the truth, as revealed by the facts and phenomena of nature. And, finally, if there was anything irreverent or irreligious in the matter, that irreligion must rest with those who would thus vindictively endeavour to thwart the search after truth, and to repress the aspirations of the soul and intellect after a knowledge of the Creator, as revealed in his highest and noblest creation, Man, and in his relations to God, to his fellow-men, and to the beautiful world by which he was surrounded.

Dr. HUNT, in a few words, expressed his pleasure at the vote of thanks that had been accorded to him, which was the more enhanced from the circumstance that it had been seconded by, as he believed, his sincere and honest opponents of last year. Dr. Hunt then announced that the Section would hold its second meeting on Monday, at three o'clock, and in the same hall, when several papers of interest would be read and submitted to discussion—the tickets of the British Association giving admittance.

The opinions expressed by the local press, or by correspondents of newspapers on the spot, will perhaps better indicate the effect of this first and only meeting of the Conference than any remarks of our own.

The anthropologists, before this meeting, were denounced for "holding a theory"; now they were denounced in like manner because they had no theory. The following leader from the *Dundee Courier* appeared the day after the first meeting of the Conference. It runs as follows :—

" AN UNSCIENTIFIC SCIENCE.

"The anthropologists, denied the privilege of having a department to themselves by the Council of the British Association, have set up on their own account. They have taken the Union Hall, where they held a conference yesterday, and are to meet and read papers and discuss on the first three days of next week. Perhaps some of our readers—the non-scientific portion—may ask, What is anthropology, and why is it denied a sub-section by the British Association? The definition given by those who profess to know is that it is 'the science of man.' We are not quite sure that that will make the matter any clearer. It is only shifting one name for another. The explanation stands in need of being explained. We are doubtful if we shall quite succeed in an attempt to be explanatory, for the anthropologists themselves seem to be rather misty as to exactly what anthropology is. There is a sad lack of precision among them, and an utter want of agreement. According to Dr. Hunt, the president of the Anthropological Society, who yesterday delivered the inaugural address, there are in London about eight hundred members of the Society, and probably no two of them agree in their conclusions. They have no creed, and not even a theory. Dr. Hunt does not deem that a disadvantage. Indeed, he vaunts it as a merit. If anthropologists had a theory, anthropology would not, in his judgment, be worthy to be called a science at all. It is this absence of a theory which makes it scientific. The old meaning of the word science, which used to, and still does, among such scientific men as the Association permits to meet in sections, imply settled knowledge, is abandoned, and science, anthropologically considered, means an uncertain groping among facts, and either a Babel of conclusions or a chaos of inconclusiveness. The idea has novelty to recommend it, but we apprehend that is its sole recommendation. The anthropologists, however, do not do justice to themselves. Anthropology, if it is not yet, aspires to be, a science of the most ambitious order. It is to deal with man in all his relations, and consequently with all the things to which man is related. 'The Science of Man' is too modest a title. It is a science of the universe that is aimed at. Anthropology, to be complete, must be all the 'ologies' in one. The Anthropological Society, to answer its purpose, must absorb the British Association and all its sections. The undertaking is a gigantic one, and we only hope Dr. Hunt and his colleagues may prove equal to it. We may easily apprehend, then, why the Council of the Association refused a sub-section to anthropo-

logy ; but that perception only throws us across a difficulty. Why did the Council last year at Nottingham allow an anthropological subsection to be formed ? If it was good for Nottingham, why is it bad for Dundee ? The answer, we presume, is, that there is a general opinion that religious feeling is not so strong in England as in Scotland, and the rulers of the Association had to arrange its sections with reference to its geographical position. We may at once appreciate the compliment paid to us Northerners, and perceive the fact that the savans owe any embarrassment they may have suffered to their own imprudence. There is an old tradition to which it might be worth the while of even philosophers to pay attention. It is, that evil spirits never come across our thresholds unless we invite them in. If an anthropological department had not been formed, we should not now have anthropologists in our midst with, if not a grievance, the appearance of one, and a grievance, too, that is very apt to awake popular sympathy—the grievance, to wit, that free discussion is being stifled. Next to the apparent unwisdom of giving anthropology, as Dr. Hunt describes it, a department, is the unwisdom of banishing it. If the latter step had not been taken, those who have gained the opportunity of making themselves conspicuous would probably have remained unheeded, if not unnoticed. As it is, it is not unlikely they will attract larger audiences than any of the sections. The affair may furnish us with another instance of mending a hole and making a bigger one. Even philosophers do not always avoid getting ‘out of the frying-pan into the fire.’ If we may accept Dr. Hunt’s statement, the unwisdom is even worse than we have pictured it. He says that if anthropologists uphold a theory, there are theories to which they are antagonistic. They do not believe that our ancestors were apes, and they are opposed to Darwin’s theory of the origin of species. If that be so, the anthropologists owe a debt of ingratitude to the friends who have defended them, for they have certainly by those friends been represented as holding, or at all events favouring, the doctrines Dr. Hunt disavowed. But then there is room for just a faint suspicion that the Council of the Association had some reason to doubt the prudence of introducing anthropology to a Scotch public, and that Dr. Hunt’s address has been written with just a tinge of a desire to suit the latitude and longitude of Dundee. The man of the greatest weight among the speakers was Mr. David Page of Edinburgh, who has some reputation as a geologist, and he plainly enough indicated his feeling that anthropology is opposed to the Mosaic account of creation. It may be that, as the anthropologists have some hundreds of theories among themselves, and no theory in common, Dr. Hunt gave expression to the real state of his feelings ; but as Mr. Page will probably take a prominent part in the proceedings, and as he is not inclined to suppress his antagonism to “certain cosmogonies,” the Council of the Association may have an opportunity of seeing how unwise they were at Nottingham, and how unwisely they have in Dundee endeavoured to escape the results of their unwisdom.”

On Monday afternoon the special correspondent of the *Edinburgh*

Daily Review writes as follows, and very similar accounts appeared in other papers :—

“I thought that I should have to-day to send you an account of another meeting of the Anthropological Conference, but I am relieved from that task. The Anthropological Conference has come to an end. Its first meeting was also its last. You are not, however, to imagine from that the anthropologists have been defeated. The fact is, they have won a victory, if not a decisive and complete one. They have secured such a compromise as is in effect a triumph. How that has happened I may, perhaps, profitably occupy some of your space in explaining ; for, if I am not mistaken, this passage in the history of the Association is not only significant of the present, but also foreshadows the future.

“The anthropologists, before the commencement of the proceedings at Dundee, were visited by apprehensions that anthropology was not to have the same favour accorded to it this year as it received last year at Nottingham, when the so-called science had a department to itself. They expected it was to be, if not snuffed out, crammed up into a corner and discouraged. I am inclined to think they were not without some grounds for their fears and suspicions. Men have to accommodate themselves to the circumstances which arise out of their geographical position, and these circumstances are mental and moral as well as physical. The tendency is expressed in the adage which bids those who go to Rome to do as Rome does. There are among the leaders of the British Association, as well as of all other associations, ‘politic’ men, and it is not unreasonable to infer that they thought anthropology would not be well received in Scotland. Perhaps that impression, if it was not originated, was strengthened by the fact that a Dundee newspaper had, in its correspondence respecting the Nottingham meeting, spoken of anthropology and anthropologists in anything but a flattering manner. So this year the anthropologists were not to have a department. Ethnology and geography were put together, and the anthropologists were to have their papers read in that section, or in the biological or geological section, according to the special character of the contributions. ‘Divide and conquer,’ is an old maxim of polity, and in this case it was modified to ‘Divide and make safe. What was deemed a dangerous element, instead of being concentrated in a body, would thus have been scattered, and would not have been so powerful or conspicuous as if united. But you know what often happens to ‘the best laid schemes of mice and men.’ So in this case the plan—if there were a plan, and I think there was one—failed. It did worse than fail. Not only was its purpose not attained, but, as its direct consequence, the anthropologists became far more conspicuous than they would have been if a section had been assigned to them. They gained the opportunity of making a noise and attracting notice, and I need hardly say that is worth something to a party which is anxious to make its way in the world, and has the boldness and dexterity necessary for seizing and using any opportunity that may be presented to it.

"The way in which the opportunity was used shows how very small a lance may produce a great effect. An invitation was sent to the anthropologists to visit Dundee. Probably not more than a score of persons knew of the step, and they, although they are respectable in their stations, are not men of mark, position, or influence. The invitation was accepted, a 'Reception Committee' was formed, the anthropologists arrived, and a cry was got up that free discussion was being smothered. There was an apparent pretext for that cry, though it seems to me only a pretext, for if there had been anything more the paper of Mr. Crawford on the Antiquity of Man, and that read to-day by Sir John Lubbock 'On the Origin of Civilisation and the Early Condition of Man,' would have been excluded. But for an effective cry a pretext is often sufficient, and having got that, the anthropologists were provided with a fulcrum. They took a hall, issued their programme, and held their preliminary meeting on Friday. To-day they were to have commenced their 'business.' Three o'clock was fixed for the hour of meeting—a skilful device. If the Conference had been held at eleven o'clock, when the sections open, the anthropologists, many of whom are members of the Association, would have had either to have left anthropology to itself, or have given up attendance at the sections, and the audiences might have been thin ones. But the Conference beginning when the sections closed, the anthropologists would be at liberty, and the public unoccupied. The result would, I believe, have been that the hall would have been filled, and that doctrines, which those who believe the Bible to be true cannot help regarding as false and pernicious, would have been placed before a large number of persons. The very fact that the subject is a dangerous one would have been an attraction. The idea that it was forbidden would have roused and stimulated curiosity. It is useless to attempt to conceal that here very considerable interest has been awakened. On Saturday, though there were so many excursion parties, the hall filled to hear Mr. Crawford on the Antiquity of Man; and to-day, when Sir John Lubbock read his paper, the room was so crowded that I had hard work to push my way into a place. The assemblage, too, was composed of the very *élite* of Dundee society, and the closest attention was paid to the paper. I do not wish you to infer from that that anthropological doctrines are gaining acceptance, but I do desire you to understand that great curiosity is being manifested about them, and that considerable attention is being paid to them. No one who observes what is going on here can come to any other conclusion. I would write otherwise if I could, for the doctrines are to me abominable, and they are as weakly supported as they are bad; but then, weakly as they are supported, there is no strong opposition to them. That would not have mattered so much if the topic had not been pushed into prominence by the circumstances I have mentioned; but as it is, there may be, especially among the young, a crop of evil results.

"The position the anthropologists had gained by securing the attention of the public to their Conference promised such present advantages, that there is room for some surprise at their giving it up; but I

presume they have looked forward to the future. At the end of last week negotiations appear to have commenced between them and the authorities of the Association, the result of which is that anthropology is to be recognised. The anthropologists, geographers, and ethnologists are to be combined in a section. Thus the anthropologists, with such a weak lever as the Reception Committee, have forced the hand of the British Association, which, for the future, will number among its scientific departments one devoted to a science which has no theory, the students of which are without unity of view, and which in any, or every one, of its aspects is antagonistic to the Mosaic account of creation."

On Tuesday, September 10th, the following leader appeared in the *Dundee Courier*, and will indicate the change of tone in which the action of the anthropologists was received by the local press. It is headed thus:—

"SKILL AND FORCE.

"The affairs of this world are decided at least as much, if not more, by skill than by force. That is true even of physical conflicts, but it is still more certain in its application to mental contests. It is on record that Lee, when he faced Grant in that last desperate struggle in Virginia, had at no time more than thirty thousand men to oppose to the hundred of thousands in his front. Dr. Hunt, the leader of the anthropologists, if we may estimate him after the world's fashion, by results, is a better strategist than General Lee. The anthropologists bear, perhaps, about the same proportion to the British Association as the handful of Confederates did to the multitudes of the Federals; but while Lee was defeated, Dr. Hunt has won. It must not be forgotten, however, that this anthropological tactician had an advantage which Lee did not enjoy. Grant never placed his army in a false position—the Association was committed to one. If the anthropologists had never been accorded a department, they would not have had that weapon which we call a grievance. But having been formed into a department at Nottingham, and not being recognised at Dundee, they were able to cry out that they had been 'suppressed,' and to demand the reason for the 'suppression.' The demand was a very inconvenient one. The department had been 'suppressed.' There could be no doubt about that. The proof was patent. So far as the arrangements of the Association were concerned, Anthropology had been, but was not. It might not have been difficult to say why it was not; but it might have been disadvantageous. If the reason is not to be sought in mere caprice, and that we do not believe, there was but another alternative. It was because the Association this year meets in Scotland, and the northern latitude was supposed to necessitate certain conditions, of which the 'suppression' (that, we think, was Mr. Page's expression) of anthropology was one. But it would never have done to have said that. So the Association when it was accused was practically defenceless, because its only defence was worse than a plea of guilty. They had committed themselves at Nottingham.

They could not justify the retracing of their steps at Dundee except by a mode of justification more damaging than silence.

"The anthropologists, then, had a vantage-ground from which to act; but they required something more. If it be allowable to employ, figuratively, a term which belongs to mechanics, we should say that the anthropologists wanted leverage. They could not act on the Association from within. If Dr. Hunt had proposed an Anthropological Section, he would not, as we understand him to say, have found a seconder for his motion. They had to act from without, and, like Archimedes, they needed a fulcrum. More fortunate than Archimedes, they found or made one. A Reception Committee was formed to invite the anthropologists to Dundee, to receive them when they came, and to co-operate with them while they stayed. It is that Reception Committee that especially impresses us with the truth of the saying which attributes great events to small causes. We are sure the members of that committee will agree with us in saying that they possess but small public influence—so little, indeed, that it would have been deemed absurd to suppose they could have turned the British Association from its course. But a small stone may throw a large train off the rails. With the grievance of 'suppression' for lever, and the Reception Committee for fulcrum, the anthropologists have shaken the Association, and we are informed authoritatively that negotiations are going on with the view of recognising anthropology and embodying it in a section. Mr. Walpole negotiated with the Reform League, and Hyde Park is available for public meetings; her Majesty's Ministers are assumed to have trembled before Mr. Beales, and so we have a Reform Bill. What wonder, then, if the Association has succumbed to Dr. Hunt and his friends, and anthropology is to have a place. Whatever may be the case with respect to anthropology, which Dr. Hunt informs us has none of the elements of a science, there is one art which has been brought almost to perfection—it is the art of agitation.

"It is impossible not to admire the politic moderation exhibited by the anthropologists. They had secured a position which in Dundee would have given them greater advantages than a part of a section would afford. What with their grievance, which had enabled them to make a noise, and the subtle attractions of a subject of doubtful propriety, they would probably have had larger audiences than any of the sections; but, like wise men, they sacrificed the present to the future. If they had not made peace, they would have had to make the same efforts every year, and while their lever of grievance would, as time went on, have become weaker, a fulcrum might not always have been available; but, by negotiating, they have made themselves a part of our great National Scientific Association, and gained a permanent stand-point from which to preach a science without a theory, to followers, no two of whom have views in common. It is seldom we have such an instance of how the mighty may be coerced by the comparatively weak, when the mighty begin by putting themselves in the wrong, and then struggle to evade the consequences without openly going back to the right."

We have no space to dwell further on the notices given of this meeting of the Dundee Anthropological Conference. Nor shall we here dilate on the future hopes of anthropologists in connection with the British Association. On one point, however, we do feel it our duty to express our opinion, viz., on the continuance of the meetings of such a conference. Our readers will remember that at Birmingham a letter was read from Professor Owen, in which he strongly advised that anthropologists should annually hold a Conference or Congress, and that such a recommendation was supported by so veteran a public scientific caterer as Sir Roderick Murchison. This year the Duke of Buccleuch has given it as his opinion that the number of such associations as the British Association ought to be increased. We cannot but think that the anthropologists in this country are very grateful for these hints. The time may not be far distant when such a Conference may be held. But let it not be supposed for an instant that anthropologists will ever give up the claim of having their natural place in a national scientific association. We are glad to know that on this point there is no difference of opinion amongst anthropologists, whatever may be the wishes of some of the elder members of the British Association.

ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION.

ON an occasion when, for good or evil, anthropology, as a science, has not been encouraged by the British Association, it seems at first sight incorrect to head an article with the title so familiar to the readers of this *Review*. But it is quite impossible to exclude the science from the arena of section E, although nominally it has been "left out in the cold." Wherever the study of the science of man receives any support, there necessarily must anthropology be present, and the meeting at Dundee had its share of anthropological papers contributed by various gentlemen. It is only to be regretted that, with very few exceptions, none of these papers were new. All Mr. Crawford's papers had been long familiar to the scientific public. Perhaps it is good policy on the part of the writers of these papers to attempt a larger popularity for them than they might otherwise receive, but it is a poor compliment to the scientific parliament of Britain to set such long-preserved meats before its members as solid